

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/682,732		BLACKBURN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Marie Patterson		3728	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marie Patterson.

(3) Ron Blackburn.

(2) Jason Wolfe.

(4) Craig Dennis.

Date of Interview: 10/25/04&10/26/04.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: all of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants argued the importance of the "consisting" language to claim the important feature of the insert having only a single sheet of steel with the thickness as claimed to increase comfort (due to the thinness of the sheet) and to eliminate the problem of deterioration caused by sweat and unseen fractures which occur in multilayered sheets of steel (such as that shown by Yant). Also, the use of a single thin sheet of steel reduces cost and weight of the insert. Applicants' also argued the importance of the orthotic cushion layer being shaped with a lip portion that extends upwardly and outwardly relative to the perimeter of the sheet of steel to allow the three layered insert to snugly fit into a plurality of sizes of shoes. After further search and consideration in view of applicants arguments, the Examiner and applicant have agreed upon the attached Examiners amendment to place the application in condition for allowance .